DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 307 655 EA 020 191

AUTHOR Kanpol, Barry
TITLE Teacher Resistance and Accommodation to Structural Factors of Schooling: Possibilities and Limitations.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 48p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988). Best copy available.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Employer Employee Relationship; *Ethnography; Marxian Analysis; *School Organization; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Alienation; *Teacher Militancy; *Teaching Conditions; Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS Willis (Paul)

ABSTRACT

This article presents ethnographic data to elaborate the nature of teacher resistance and accommodation to the structural context of schooling, and it illustrates the dynamics of group solidarity among a group of eighth-grade middle school teachers. The analysis is predicated on concepts identified by Paul Willis in his study "Learning to Labor: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs." These concepts--penetrations, dislocations, and limitations--are studied as a means to understand the hegemonic conditions found by teachers in their work lives. The analysis also seeks to demonstrate the possibilities that accompany present forms of teacher resistance and to show the limitations on the further development of emancipatory teacher behavior. (TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED307655

Teacher Resistance and Accommodation to Structural Factors of Schooling

Barry Kanpol
Chapman College

Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association conference. April, 1988, New Orleans

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Kanpol

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 020 191

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Teacher Resistance and Accommodation to Structural Factors of Schooling: Possibilities and Limitations.

Introduction

Literature on teacher resistance/accommodation to structural factors in educational fields is sparse. Empirical studies of the same nature have been few. Theorists such as Giroux, Aronowitz, Wexler, Apple, McClaren, Bullough and Gitlin [1] have carefully scrutinized what teacher "resistance" at the field site does and does not entail. Some educational resistance theorists, such as Bullough and Gitlin admit that "the debate over what is resistance and its place in theories of cultural and economic reproduction is a healthy example of critical dialogue, but thus far the empirical work needed to link teacher resistance with emancipatory change is missing."[2] They conduct what I believe to be necessary but limited empirical investigations into teacher resistance. Following a single subject for instance, as in Bullough and Gitlins study of "Dave," will surely allow for a deeper understanding of one person's struggles, which include intentional resistance to authority that involve emancipatory interests.[3]

I maintain, however, that investigation into what I believe to be the key concept in understanding teacher resistance - group solidarity - is missing. Furthermore, how teacher group solidarity functions at the structural level is not dealt with systematically by theorists. None of the above mentioned authors, have looked deeply or systemically enough at how a group of teachers informally conduct power struggles that might be described as analogous to the "macho militancy" espoused by the "lads" in Willis' Learning to Labor: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs.[4] Nor have they related these struggles to the forms of reflection[5] and emancipatory[6] practices that lead to the now commonly used term, "teacher empowerment."[7]

I wish to thank R. Pratte and H.S. Shapiro for their helpful comments and cirticisms of this paper. I remain solely responsible for the content.

In order to nudge the understanding of teacher "resistance", further along, it is imperative for resistance theorists not to forget, that the tension that is involved in teachers' lives at the school site has necessarily to do with resistance and accommodation to the structural context of schooling. This article will deal with this issue. I will present ethnographic data to elaborate the nature of "resistance" and will illustrate the dynamics of group solidarity among a group or eighth grade middle school teachers. In the form of analysis, I have returned to the concepts identified by Willis in his seminal study, Learning to Labor - penetrations, dislocations and limitations - as the means to understand the hegemonic conditions found by teachers in their work lives. This analysis of a group of eighth grade teachers will hopefully demonstrate the possibilities that accompany present forms of teacher resistance, and show the limitations to the further development of emancipatory teacher behavior.

First I must clear up some distinctions lurking in the background. For example: What is resistance? In order to help clear the confusion of what "resistance" is composed of, a further distinction between "hegemony" and "counter hegemony" must be made. Derived from the Italian Marxist, Antonio Gramsci, hegemony acts to saturate our consciousness. Hegemony refers to the body of practices, energy, lived experiences or common sense interpretations which become our unquestioning world. Hegemony, then, refers to an organized assemblage of meanings, wherein the central, effective and dominant system of meanings, values and actions are lived. These lived actions contain meanings and values, and constitute the limits of common sense knowledge. They are part of our consciousness. This common sense is shared meaning, perpetuated in social practice through images and ideas embedded in everyday life. Common examples of shared meanings can be viewed through media coverage, and in areas of aesthetics, such as in art, music, painting, theatre and

movies. Importantly, it is not one group that deliberately exerts control over other groups. What results is a kind of ideational control that is not the result of conflict or overt manipulation. Rather, a social cohesion is an outcome of hegemony in the generalized adoption of ideas, values, images, and feeling structures by a social collectivity.

It is the power of hegemony that promotes social control and continuity. Researchers have explained how processes of hegemonic control over people's ideas, images and forms of consciousness result from a prolonged and continuing struggle.[8] With this struggle in mind, they also view schooling as a possible socially transformative site. The notion of resistance to cultural reproductive aspects of knowledge, skills, values and attitudes[9] suggests what the literature terms, "counter hegemony" as a possibility for social transformation.

Two issues must be made clear here. First, counter hegemony can be viewed as a form of hegemonic resistance or cultural production. It is process of meaning making and/or alternative knowledge, the activity, creativity and hope of a possible way out of the determined reproductive aspects of knowledge previously discussed. Second, with the above in mind, counter hegemony can also be ironically viewed as another way of incorporating resistant groups, such as those represented by the "lads" into the reproductive relations already delineated. Put differently, resistant acts are needed and must be incorporated in social relations for reproduction to be accomplished. This double view of counter hegemonic/resistant acts has provided sociologists of education with quite a dilemma. How does one view teachers? Are they passive bearers of the ideology, resistors to structural and hegemonic constraints, both resistors and accommodators, or just one or the other? What are the functions of teachers in the wider social context? Are they simply pawns in a game manipulated by the state department? That is, are they

totally deskilled or are they what I term, reskilled, political messengers of sorts or productive links to social transformative activities?[10] It is as if Willis' words about cultural production and its relationship to the "lads" echo in the background:

> Cultural production is the active principle of the cultural level and stresses the notion of social agents at their furthest from being passive bearers and transmitters of structure and ideology. They are seen instead, as active appropriators who produce meanings, and cultural forms by the transformation of material and products... cultural production is the process of the collective, creative use of discourses, meanings, materials, practices and group processes to explore, understand and creatively occupy particular positions, relations and sets of material possibilities.[11]

These cultural productive links allude to the notions elaborated on by Aronowitz and Giroux as "empowerment." To possess power according to Aronowitz and Giroux would be for teachers to understand concrete sets of practices that produce different experiences. The implication here is that a reskilling of teachers t the social site of the educational institution would involve not only the understanding of the role of the school in the social order, but empowerment. This would suggest counter-hegemonic probabilities and possibilities for social action. Put differently, it also hints at change of a sort that would suggest empowerment: a changing consciousness than the already determined force of hegemony which saturates consciousness.

It is at this point that one may ask: What directions are teachers facing today? What counter-hegemonic struggle exists in practice, that is creative, productive, emancipatory, self-reflective, democratic and moral? Certain data will be now presented and will then by analyzed with reference to the resistant and accommodative teacher, and possibilities and limitations of teachers empowerment. Before presenting the data however, further distinctions should be cleared up so as allowing the possibility to look at areas where teacher resistant acts can be

found.

It is in the realm of the informal pragmatic routines that an oppositional culture that runs counter to official or expected behavior thrives.[12] There are certain cultural effects when this opposition thrives. One way of understanding the informal pragmatic realm is from the point of view of routines. Routines can be described as human behavior which is repeatedly engaged in. Thus, an ethnographer is able to look for the meaning behind the summation of these behaviors for an understanding of a situation. In effect then, routines are particular behaviors that are engaged in repeatedly.[13]

Routine teacher behavior, making up the oppositional, informal, counter-culture zone of schooling, can be said to operate within the pragmatic routines. Pragmatic routines can be described as instances in the school day where teachers may act in accordance with what is best for them in order to complete work. Thus, arriving late to class and/or team meetings or breaking policies and rules and using a particular talk code between teachers may be used simply as tools to help manage and control the school day. These could be said to be the informal, oppositional and pragmatic routines that a researcher could repeatedly observe and hear. This could include what shall be termed "resistant strategies" aimed at undermining the power of school administrators.

Willis' description and interpretation of the counter-culture such as that espoused by the "lads" is a form of contestation. Willis elaborates on the nature of this type of contestation. It is, he says:

> a mode of opposition in this society and it reserves itself as the exception to the rule. It is unaware of its own rules. The analysis of the world which actually directs its distinctively cultural responses remains silent. It is to this silence that ideology confidentially strides. Whether right of wrong, whether penetrated or not, it is the rule, it is the voice.[14]

Even though the formal routines of schooling such as the following of rules or behaving in a respectful way towards teacher authority are rejected, the "formal lingers on and opposition and alternative interpretation are reserved off into exceptions to the rule."[15]

Until recently, the issue of the "informal" and "pragmatic" in teacher's school lives has been subject to almost selective inattention. The significance of the informal and pragmatic routines of teachers' lives in school is of vast importance for understanding what occurs there. Interviewing, questioning, and probing into the nature of these routines opens up the subject and makes it visible for further studies. To what extent are these characteristics present in teachers' lives in schools? This question is of central importance, and needs to be answered to throw further light on the possibilities and imitations of resistance as empowerment and emancipation.

Tension Between Cultures

Four teachers were chosen for this particular ethnographic case study at Hillview in the Winter of 1986. They were followed individually and intensively for equal periods, lasting up to four months. Teachers were interviewed individually and at team meetings. The researcher often spent time with teachers after school hours and at social gatherings in particular. The teachers were chosen for this study as the principal viewed them as the "trouble makers" of school. A tension existed between management (authority figures such as the principal and vice-principal) and its workers, the teachers.

Important to this study, and basic to society is the capitalist exchange. Here, the worker exchanges his labor for a wage packet. In the school, there is another kind of exchange. This involves the teacher/learner exchange.[16] Here, the teacher passes knowledge to students and in return, students are expected to respect the

teacher and behave well. There exists still another exchange in schooling. This exchange has to do with teachers and administrators (principal/vice -principal and a counsellor for instance). Importantly, on a formal basis, the principal and vice-principal have control of the school in the immediate sense, i.e. on school grounds. They possess the authority and control over decisions about private school policies in a public sector.

The exchange between administrators and teachers arises because of the distance between them in their defining roles. Because the principal/vice-principal has the legal and professional authority to be in charge, certain teacher behavior is expected. This behavior entails the teacher providing certain knowledge, skills, values and attitudes that will promote his/her good work in and out of class. Respect is desired by administrators and is part of this exchange. In return for the above, the teacher may receive a good evaluation, a possible letter or recommendation, and an understanding that would involve the principal being lenient in some cases to teachers who buy into the exchange so as not to give them added burdens to their already trying day. Importantly, one must ask, what happens when the exchange doesn't occur? Why doesn't it occur? What happens when teachers don't buy into all aspects of the exchange is a vital issue at Hillview and can be viewed as forming the tension between cultures at the school. Because of the tension of the two cultures there exists a teacher counter-culture --that is, a culture that differentiates itself from both the formal and official aspects of what a teacher is supposed to be and doing exists, especially on the practical level. This differentiation manifests itself in numerous ways and can be vividly described as a break of supposed official policy.

Basic to the exchange of teachers and administrators is the giving of consent by teachers to administrators to lead their way, without any or much interference.

This notion is met with resistance by some teachers at Hillview, as seen through the striking faces and ongoing disagreements over discipline procedures during staff meetings between the principal and teachers, resulting in face-to-face avoidance in the corridors between administrators and teachers.

Basic to teacher withdrawal of consent is oppositional talk. Eighth grade teacher interviews and responses to questionnaires indicate that teachers judge the administration as lacking strong leadership. The teachers agree that little leadership exists.

Mr. X commented about the administration:

> My relationship with the administration is not very good. Lack of respect on my part. I don't take them to be professional or to be here for the kids. A general lack of respect as there's no leadership.

The concern of Ms. A is that "the principal is not doing his job well." This teacher's misgivings are shared with other teachers. Ms. Y enters Ms. A's class (from next door) and both teachers begin to talk about the principal, about how it is "his responsibility to take care of things." Ms. A expresses concern:

> He's ready to retire, he's just putting in his years now.

This oppositional talk about the leadership of the administration occurs daily. In another incident, an inspector from the State department is at the school. The teachers, desiring to get in their work to someone "outside" the school, voice an opinion about a matter under their breath so no one can actually hear them. Says Ms. A to a colleague, discretely, in the meeting, almost in front of the principal: "I hope that we can get a chance to speak to her (state inspector). Hope we can throw him (principal) out.' I want to speak to the inspector about him." Eventually the principal leaves. Immediately, Ms. A pounces on the State Inspector with these comments about teacher evaluation:

> When he said he was going to get out more often into the classrooms, I just about fell out of my chair. He's out in the halls. He rarely handles any problems. He doesn't tell teachers who aren't doing their job to do it. There's a big staff morale problem. I don't think there is anyone in control here, or any strong leadership.

Ms. A is concerned about the inability of the principal to be a good leader. She confronts the area supervisor and the principal:

> Everything you told us here we already know that stuff you know. We're just talking around the whole central issue, that I personally, I can't speak for the rest of the team on this, I just don't think we have a whole lot of leadership. I'm sorry to say, but he's very inconsistent.

The above judgments of Ms. A are constantly confirmed and reinforced to her through specific actions of the principal. There are days when A's students from S.O.A.R. period, (an acronym for "Special Opportunities to Achieve Results Program,") don't come to class. Ms. A is told by one of her students that everyone is in the auditorium for a special assembly involving a West Point graduate. This situation is judged by Ms. A to represent the administration's lack of ability to get things under control and relate messages efficiently.

X's perception of the administration's falterings is evident in a meeting with the State Inspector:

> Inspector: What would you like to have the administration do?
>
> Mr. X: To be able to have some authority and to have complete back-up from the administrative personnel. There's too much miscommunication, a lot of secrecy, and the fact that the communication between us and the people downtown is so sporadic nobody knows what anybody is doing.

In an interview with another eighth grade teacher, she comments that "the eighth grade team should run the school, "each one of us has different expertise, we could run the school without the principal." She also says that they (the eighth grade team of teachers) "do run the school, but aren't given credit for it."

On the same issue another eight grade teacher comments:

> "We had to change the kids' schedule ourselves and its the administration's responsibility, and they don't end up doing it, so we ended up doing it in our spare time."

These actions by the administration, be they by the principal or vice-principal, confirm the teachers' judgments about weak administrative leadership and a lack of control of immediate and long-term discipline situations. This prompts the eighth grade teacher to take certain actions, individually and as a team, in order to get things accomplished.

Administrative failures only confirm to teachers that they must take leadership into their own hands. Such was the case with the school discipline plan and with scheduling.

In another incident involving three eighth-grade boys and two girls, one of the boys was officially accused of sexually assaulting one of the girls off the school grounds. Eighth grade teachers were upset that they weren't told about the incident until two months after its occurrence, and that nothing was done about the boy except that he was put on probation. A letter of complaint with the signatures of each member of the "team" is sent to the principal and the area supervisors:

> It is hard for us to understand two items: 1) why we were not informed of the incident and 2) why there was not school disciplinary action against those involved...from this unfortunate incident we would like to see several policy changes. First, we feel it necessary that we are informed of such events when they occur - - not two months later. Secondly, the school needs to respond to such incidents in a swift, effective and visible manner.

Hence, weak leadership is a key issue that the eighth grade teachers talk about. There is little or none in their eyes, thereby nullifying the teacher-administration exchange. Teachers take matters into their own hands. To illustrate this, I will first lay out official components of schooling and then describe teacher routines. It is within the pragmatic routines by the teacher counter-culture or informal group, that teachers as individuals and as a group confront the weaknesses of the structure of schooling.

Official Versus Pragmatic Routines: Middle School Philosophy

The Middle School philosophy is officially written up in the Basic Components of Middle Schools.[17] Certain components of the day are written up within the time schedule set up in the teacher's handbook.[18] Officially, teachers are supposed to be in their class at 7:35 am.., a full ten minutes before homeroom period begins at 7:45 a.m. They are to remain in the school building until 3:00 p.m., fifteen minutes after students have left. If leaving early, the principal or vice-principal must be notified so that arrangements can be made for a replacement teacher. Concerning discipline, teachers have strict procedures they must follow, and corrective measures they must adhere to.

One of the reasons that the eighth grade teachers I followed want to move out of Hillview is because of what is perceived as a weak administration. Another reason is the impossibility of teachers to reach the ideal goals set by the official outlines. This is due to certain limitations of the students as perceived by teachers at Hillview. While Mr. X looks upon matters as "we can't help a lot of these students at Hillview," other eighth grade teachers are not of the same opinion. Ms. A and Ms. Y are often involved in preparing incentive field trips, while Ms. W works hard on the candy sale. Teachers in this study, work overtime for their students.

One thing is certain though. All but one of the teachers I followed has had enough of working at Hillview. Ms. Y says to the team, in front of the principal with the area supervisor sitting by her:

I've been thinking of a transfer - I hate the tension at this school.

The eighth grade staff often say that they are frustrated by the "tensions" of the school. Yet, through it all, the teachers have on thing in common. They agree that they are basically at the school to "help students." To better understand

this, a peek at what goes on in their classrooms is needed.

The four teachers routinely "socialize" with their students by talking about personal issues of the students or about the activities of the weekend. This talk often involves activities done at school, like the science fair project, the selling of candy for the school dance and field trip, or even the kind of car a teacher may own as compared to other teachers' cars. As I follow the teachers, I can see that each teacher has a good rapport with the students.

Students in general like these teachers, even though one student comments that Mr. X makes me work, work, work, copy notes all the time. He hard man, but he still good," and A "lets us talk quietly instead of reading silently, "and although "W come late all the time," students are generally appreciative of their teachers.

Still, one must take a closer look at the type of talk done in class to picture what other attitudes teachers hold toward their students. It may just be that these attitudes differ from the guidelines set up for teachers.

Mr. X says to students who don't pay attention:

> Part of the problem is that you don't pay attention. Are you sure I haven't been transported to another planet?

Mr. X is at times perplexed not only at the attitudes but also at the standards of his students:

> You guys don't know where you are going ...I'm to get your brains started again and that the only excuse for you not doing your assignment is if you are in a coma, not your dog pissing on a paper...My attitude is to help the kids who want to learn, and those screwing up and getting suspended - to hell with them, because we don't have the time or facility, and there's nothing we can do to change board policy.

Many a time, teachers will threaten their students so as some work will get done. Ms. Y to her students:

> It would be wise to do your homework, or don't bother coming to school, and if your task is not completed in ten minutes, you'll be in the time-out room for two hours.

Out of class talk also relates attitudes of teachers to their students; Mr. X on his way to grading a test given to all his classes:

> It's a pity that I have to give them these objective tests, but I wouldn't do it any other way. It' the easiest, especially when there's 120 people to grade; besides, they haven't got the skills to write comprehensively, which is in great part due to the State Department, Federal policy and this school who don't want to hear about distinctions over individuals. We're not organizing the problem that we have over class differences. The principal's big bitch is not to have ability groups. Therefore, this school is not recognizing the problem of illiteracy.

Talk about the students is a large part of the daily activities of teachers at Hillview. A very important question is whether the administration inadvertently or directly has anything to do with teacher attitudes regarding students. According to the eighth grade team, "If the administration would change its policies, so would we."

The above description of the tension between what is the official policy--the supposed attitudes toward students--as opposed to actual attitudes, helps form a specific teacher counter-culture. This claim is argued in the ensuing sections.

S.O.A.R. and Common Planning Time: Official and Pragmatic

Period 0 or the S.O.A.R. period, is an official block of time providing students with individual assistance, sustained silent reading, extra-curricular activities, student council meetings, assemblies, and music practice sessions, where students and teachers are supposed to share similar activities, be it sustained silent reading for the whole school, clubs or independent studies, etc. In addition to the 0 period, third period is also a designated "team" planning time. The periods 0 and 3, are non-instructional periods. The key to this "team" approach is for teachers to continually interact and exchange ideas, improve and change the curriculum--whatever that may mean.

This period is also used for counselling students, assigning various duties

designated by school authorities to teachers, for example: hall duty, academic assist period, being in the time-out room watching over students who have misbehaved in their classes or meeting with parents of problematic students. Also, once a week, on Tuesdays, the principal holds what he calls a "team meeting" during this third period.

Commonly, Mr. X sits behind his desk and grades papers during the S.O.A.R. period, enters grades in his grading book, puts student papers in order, etc. He is frequently out of class during S.O.A.R. periods, at times for fifteen minutes. He completes I-90 discipline forms or follows up on a discipline problem with the principal or vice-principal. All this is time consuming, routinely done according to Mr. X to "get at" the administration who he has come to distrust on policy issues. On S.O.A.R., says Mr. X:

> None of the students like it, me neither. I don't think it is effective. The kids don't know how to study. Most of it is a waste of time; there is no study or academic achievement.

When asked why he accepts the official purpose, Mr. X comments that:

> Teachers still bitch about it, but there's not much we can do about it unless we have an entire uprising of the staff, and we're not going to do that.

In contrast, Ms. A tends to socialize at the beginning of the S.O.A.R. period. On one occasion she compliments some of her students on their science fair projects: "Did you get an award? You guys should be proud of yourselves." Clearly, Ms. A uses the S.O.A.R. period for other purposes. On one occasion, tests are given, while Ms. A involves herself in administrative duties like organizing candy slips for the upcoming school dance. It seems then, that S.O.A.R. is a period not only used for individual studies, but also for various teacher activities, "wagging off", for "not doing things" or for letting students read what they want. Ms. A comments on the problems of S.O.A.R. The first is

administrative:

> The principal wants to look good down town, and what is intended, is not achieved...teachers use S.O.A.R. as a period of wasting time, where kids socialize.

By penetrating S.O.A.R.'s limitations, Ms. A is able to arrange her school day by making S.O.A.R. her own "free-time" period by manipulating S.O.A.R. for its official efficiencies, thus enabling her to manipulate this official component of the day into an informal, pragmatic routine.

Such is the case with Ms. W as well. About S.O.A.R. she comments that "it's a waste of time, everybody's time, my time, their time." When the bell rings at 8:00 a.m. for the start of the S.O.A.R. period, Ms. W talks to her students about personal matters and about the sale of the upcoming dance:

> Ms. W: What will we do if we sell so much candy that there will be money left over? Maybe we'll go to Wyndotte Lake.
> St: No, there's no roller coasters, man, no fun.

As with other teachers, Ms. Y uses the S.O.A.R. period "for preparing for the whole day." Instead of "supervising" students as mandated in the official teacher handbook, Ms. Y concerns herself with the sexual assault issue brought upon a student in the school. Notified of the incident later, Ms. Y concerns herself with the writing of a team letter of complaint which will be sent of higher authorities. Thus, S.O.A.R routinely becomes a time period manipulated by teachers that makes life that much more bearable for them.

Official Aspects of Teaching

In the Basic Components of Middle Schools, teaching strategies are delineated. My aim is to look at what is actually taught that falls under these strategies, or other official or informal components of the curriculum. This will be done so as to establish a tension between the official and pragmatic aspects of teaching.

Ms. A does not always use the curriculum guidelines. During literature lessons,

Ms. A will tell her students to forget about the present curriculum:

> What I'm going to do is let you relax and read different types of easier literature using the characterization, time and place, thoughts and feelings, Before we start doing anything else, I want to read to you "Sylvester and the Magic Pebble."

Students are interested in the simpler story rather than what is designated by the regular curriculum. Importantly, a discussion ensues at the class' standard. Ms. A now believes that she must take things into her own hands and so more creative, pragmatic activities with her students than the official curriculum suggests or the teacher next door designates for her own class.

Even though the official curriculum is used at times, the end for which it is used is questioned. Teachers tend to use the curriculum for their own personal ends, which may or may not be useful for student learning. Let us see how this works.

Mr. X gives students an activity to complete by the end of class. The activity involves reading and answering questions on a topic such as alcoholism, disease or drugs. Many students comment that the tasks are "boring, too many words, we copy notes most of the time in class."[19] It is not uncommon for Mr. X to leave the class and return with a cup of coffee while students are completing an exercise. At other times, Mr. X records grades, files materials, prepares overhead transparencies with answers to a particular exercise, and deals with I-90 discipline forms so as to "get at the principal." as during the S.O.A.R. period. Thus, while the official curriculum is constantly adhered to for getting students to complete exercises, it seems that it is also used so as to gain control over his daily routine.

All teachers whom I follow admit that his behavior is commonly the case. For instance, the movie "Mask" is shown in Ms. Y's class, as a reward and supplementary

curriculum material to the current issue of discussion in class on prejudice. While the movie is playing, Ms. Y's concern is with having some free-time, organizing the day by preparing other materials and with letters of complaint to the principal and area supervisor about the sexual assault issue that has the eighth-grade team buzzing.

The commonality across the board then, is the actual activity teachers routinely engage in when students are "working." Some of these activities involve adjusting the official curriculum and testing the administrative authority over discipline issues. It is in the testing of authority that these teachers are able to probe the weaknesses of the administration. Teachers exploit these weaknesses to their advantage in order to make their life easier at work. The knowledge that "we" can complain, fight the system, "make it work for us," or "get at the principal" suggests a daily existence that is ultimately tied to the informal pragmatic level of teacher routines.

Other Official Routines of the Teacher's Day Versus Pragmatic Routines

All teachers are required to prepare lesson plans, according to the State Department of Education Revised Minimum Standards.[20] Cooperative teacher planning is desired as well. Moreover, it is expected teachers will follow school policy and rules, such as being in class before students arrive, informing the administration of leaving school early, so a replacement can be found, and not eating in class, thus setting a positive example for students. To follow rules then is a designated official activity.

Not all teachers at Hillview Middle School comply with the using of State-mandated lesson plans. Comments Ms. Y:

> I do what I want in class. Nobody sits on us and tells us what to do. I haven't had my lesson plans checked in twelve years.

While sitting in the teachers' room with Ms. Y and talking to her about the upcoming visit of the State Department of Education representative, she says that she "will make a month's lesson plans on Sunday evening." She laughs mockingly at the idea that lesson plans are taken even remotely seriously by teachers. In an interview with Ms. A, she holds a small piece of paper with five or six scribbled and crossed out words. I asked her if that is her "lesson Plan," and she replies, "that's it" and as the interview continues, she comments:

> You know, we don't even hand in lesson plans here...at some schools we had to hand them in every week.

Besides arriving late to faculty team meetings, teachers admit that there are breaches of other school rules tardiness played a role in teacher group actions. Comments Mr. X:

> We all agreed that standing outside the door at 7:35 was useless, so we just do not do it all the time.

One teacher admits that she is "rarely at the door at 7:35." Rarely do other teachers follow the rule about standing outside their doors at 7:35 a.m. Rules are often broken/bent, both on an individual level and on a group level. Ms. A readily admits that other rules get broken: "I have parties when I shouldn't." Another eighth -grade teacher joins, who has left her class unattended. The party is conducted without consent given by higher authority, with a group of three eighth grade teachers who don't even consider asking permission to have it. Ms. A also admits that she leaves school early and has done so on more than one occasion. On the topic of why she doesn't report leaving school early, she says:

> This is all a challenge of his (principal's authority. I arranged some one to take my class.

Most teachers admit that they overuse the teacher allotted quota of xerox copies. Ms. A says she does this for practical purposes as sometimes she needs a

quick amount of copies for the next class as she is "running short of time." Ms. W says that she is "Miss queen ditto" and while realizing that there are limitations on the use of the xerox copies, she admits that "I occasionally break the rules. We all do."

On the whole, it is the notion of the individual and "we" (the group) that justifies actual teacher routines, as opposed to official routines. The form include intentional teacher resistance of authority and defiance to structural limitations. Resistance and accommodation allows teachers to suit their own personal needs and alleviate their occupations frustrations. There is also a sense of accomplishment and pride in Mr. X's tone of voice when he succeeds in "getting at the principal." The same can be said when Ms. A break a school rule. this sense of accomplishment is part of larger whole. A different culture is created by the teacher, first as an individual and then as the teacher group forms. this group runs counter to the official routines of school. It is an informal counter culture. Ultimately, the question remains, so what? Caught between two realms, official and pragmatic, formal and informal, with certain routines, where do teachers go from here? What does this all mean?

How Does Resistance Manifest Itself?

The three questions need answering. First, with all the apparent ill-feeling toward the administration and subsequent pragmatic routines by teachers defying official authority, which include clear resistance, how does a teachers' day remain within the structural bounds of the school? Second, how does this group differentiate itself, and form a counter-culture, from predictable and controlled structural constraints, such as time, textbook policies and schedules, that are all management controlled? Third, why do teachers choose to live in the tension and conflict that they are surrounded by everyday?

To answer the above questions leads to an understanding of the way teachers' lives are constructed in the school setting. To lay this out, it is imperative that certain concepts be elaborated so as to portray the tension between the formal and informal cultures. These concepts are used in Paul Willis' ethnography, Learning to Labor. Concepts such as individual and group logic, partial and full penetrations, divisions, dislocations and limitations will show how differences between administrators and teachers on the one hand exist, yet on the other hand are essential in the school for work to be accomplished and for teachers to live in in a tension filled environment.

Individual Logic and Group Logic

It is important in this study to note the difference between individual and group logics. With regard to the former, the ideological stress on individualism is pervasive in Western society. Harris is worth quoting at length here:

> The promotion of individualism concentrates on two aspects; independence and individuality. Each aspect stresses the role and importance of individual action in determining the nature of a person's life... As far as independence is concerned bourgeois ideology urges us to make our own way in the world, to be autonomous, to make decisions for ourselves, to act our of conscience, and so on...Independent actions are praised and rewarded...Individuality is the other prized aspect of individualism, whereby what is stressed about people is their particular uniqueness or what they do not have in common with other people...the ideological stress on individualism clearly militates against people taking collective action.[21]

This stress on individual accomplishments, be they through success and/or rewards, acts in a way to subdue group formations. Comments Harris on the individual teacher:

> Teaching in a solitary, isolated, individualistic job. classroom teaching is carried out alone, and most of the problems that arise there tend to be seen as the teacher's individual problems rather than as things shared by all teachers or even many teachers.[22]

Significantly, the importance that the formation of a group has for creativity and social mobility, as for example in the case of the "lads," my hold true for

teachers as well. Willis comments on the creativity and importance of group logic:

> Creativity is no individual act, no one particular head, and is not the result of conscious intention. It's logic could only occur ...at the group level.[23]

Group formation involves individuals working together for a particular cause (which might have to do with resisting administrative authority), helping each other out of the job in one way or another (like covering up for a teacher who has left school early), having a particular group language code (that exhibits extremist language usage, as in the case of Hillview), agreeing and acting together concerning the breaking of rules (as in not standing outside the door at a particular timed, or constantly arriving late to teacher meeting, etc.), or even possessing similar values (for instance, as to what defines a good teacher or an adequate administrator). The importance of group formation is vital to this study and vital to the role of the teacher in the social order.

The answer as to what does the group (teacher counter-culture) do together to consciously or unconsciously promote its interest will have to be dealt with. For this, I must side-step to Willis' notion of penetrations [24] for a deeper understanding to teachers' lives at the school.

Teacher Partial Penetrations

First, I will examine the penetrations of the school's individualist logic. I will then look at how teachers penetrate the teacher-administration exchange. finally, I will then look at how teachers penetrate official components of the school day.

Penetrations of the Individualist Logic

One way that Willis describes the individualistic logic and group logic is by looking at the "nature of their ideological confusion in education." He says:

> The counter-school culture makes a real penetration of what might be called the difference between individual and group logics...The essence of the

> cultural penetration concerning the school --made unselfconsciously within the structural milieu with its own practices and objects but determine all the same as inherently collective perspectives — is that the logic of class or group interests is different from the logic of individual differences.[25]

Willis tells us that partial penetrations are not conscious. He comments:

> There is a generalization in the school from an individualistic group logic without a recognition to the very nature and level of the abstraction of the latter.[26]

The teachers I follow are called the "eighth grade team." They not only share the same students, lounge, lunch quarters and social activities, but many of them share the same ideas and opinion of the administration. They are part of the formal organization of schooling, a "team" that performs tasks together. There is collective work in the organizing of the school dance. Teachers act on issues together, as in the writing of letters of complaint. Importantly the "team" acts in unison at team meetings. When the principal leaves the teachers' room, teachers say: "We sure showed him."

Teachers say "We all break rules." The group, lest we forget, has also been described by one eighth grade teacher as able to "run the school, in fact we do run the school!" This teacher counter-culture group in its formation and cultural form, then penetrates the individualistic logic.

In their classes, the group uses methods and teaches content that help partially penetrate the individualistic logic. For instance, Ms. Y's group work, her class discussions and poetry exercises on pertinent social issues such as prejudice, Ms. W's work group, her class talking an working together regarding parties, candy sales and cars, and Ms. A's democratic-like activities suggest their penetration of the individualistic logic. This penetration is achieved both in class and as a "team" without conscious recognition.

Penetrations of the Teacher-Administrator Exchange

The rejection of official routines and resistance to administrative policy an rules by teachers takes form through their withdrawal of consent to the teacher-administrator exchange. This in manifested or exhibited, at least in part, through a particular language code used by teachers that depicts their opposition and their rule-breaking activities. One teacher says, "the administration stinks," "the principal is ready to retire now," "I nearly vomited when I dreamed about him," "he always screws things up," and "we all break rules."

This teacher-administrator exchange is rejected for a number of reasons. First, teachers believe that they "run the school." In order for teachers to believe they "run the school", the exchange must be rejected. This allows for further forms of teacher control. Second, this rejection promotes group solidarity. To be part of the group means to reject the exchange. All four teachers I follow hold similar judgments of administrative ineptness. This is evident in the talk of teachers in their lounge, in front of the State Inspector and at a social gathering. In short, to reject the exchange is to define oneself as part of the group or "team." It is a payoff for good relations among teachers in and out of school. Now, to other penetrations.

Penetrations Into the Official Realms of Schooling

Penetrations into the official realm of schooling can also be seen in opposition to authority. Teachers move from following official routines of schooling through practical routines of schooling. This in part helps explain the resistance to structural components of schooling. It also helps define the teacher counter-culture.

S.O.A.R.

Teachers show penetrations that common planning time and S.O.A.R. time

(officially a time for academic achievement) is a teacher time constraint and a restriction of their autonomy. This is seen in the works of eighth grade teachers: "it's a waste of their time, my time, everyone's time," or "there's no academic achievement," and it's a time for wagging off."

The implication of the above penetration is that eighth grade teachers manipulate their time so as to suit their daily needs. Thus, certain routines are engaged in during the S.O.A.R. period, some involving "getting at the principal" and others not permitted in the official guidelines, such as leaving classes unsupervised for lengthy periods or leaving school early. Teachers then, penetrate official routines of the school day by twisting these around as a form of teacher control. Moveover, the penetration that S.O.A.R. is a "complete waste of time" prompts Mr. X and Ms. A to comment that "the principal just wants to look good downtown, so he has this S.O.A.R. time block." This penetration helps to justify the rejection of official routines in favor of pragmatic routines of schooling.

Mr. X asserts that "we don't have the time or the facility, and there's nothing we can do to change board policy," especially concerning S.O.A.R. This group sees S.O.A.R. as the State Department's control of teacher time and space; "We have to time for ourselves, too burdened with duties to breathe," "certain kids just don't have the skills and the background to succeed," and "S.O.A.R. is a way of covering the real problem which is that some students will never make it, even if S.O.A.R. is used as an independent period as well." Penetrations of official routines of schooling judged as useless helps define this counter-culture. Thus, the opposition of the teacher group advocates-culture is depicted by the move from the official routines of a school day to the pragmatic routines of teacher control.

The above necessarily entails the power and control of cultural capital.[27] In their office, teachers teach students so they come to possess, not only

reproductive capitalistic tendencies, but socially productive, ones as well,i.e. emancipatory. The latter effort may involve student tasks emphasizing "co-operation" and sharing not rote learning, but rather creatove analytical class projects. This would mean teaching different values form those of the working class.[28] It may even mean controlling aspects of schooling by manipulating "items"[29] to the teacher's advantage, individually and as a group, by working as a "team" to break rules and oppose the administration.

Cultural capital that may have emancipatory social consequences is taught to students and kept from the administration. In part, this is due to the administration's lack of interest in content taught. For instance, in Ms. Y's classroom, student discussion of prejudice and racism and of the poetry taught and written is culturally emancipative. Ms. A promotes democratic ideals by letting her class vote on issues that concern them, and Ms. W's flexibility in allowing her student to decide collectively what should be done in spare time in school and out of school on a field trip are but a few instances that suggest cultural expression and penetrations into the official aspects of the curriculum.

Interestingly, what we see here is a group of teachers whose "class" is defined by social and work relations, knowledge kept from them (as in the sexual assault issue), task differences, and relations of power and authority. Ironically these function to produce their own class — and the knowledge of the culture of the students they nurture.

To define "class" solely on a teacher's relations to economic functions is to acknowledge only part of the teacher's role in the social order. Livingstone is helpful here:

> More specifically, class relations in capitalist forms of education may be regarded in terms of the ownership of major means of cultural production and control of social and technical aspects of relations within the schooling process itself. Relations of ownership in education refer to the

possession of major means of cultural production.[30]

Because teachers' interests not only lie in reproductive, economic activities, but in productive ones as well, (as suggested by the cultural expression of the values transmitted in teachers' classes) it is not surprising that teachers have the power to seize the means of cultural production (knowledge, skills, values and attitudes) to serve their own interests, on both an individual and group level. This defines a teacher's struggle within the reproduction nature of their existence, and it enhances the teachers' class status within the school. Thus, teachers serve their own and can serve their students' interest as well.

Resistance to official routines of schooling prompted by the penetration of teachers into the official realm of the school -- the rejection of the principal-teacher exchange and the individualist logic -- leads to the eighth grade "team" partial takeover of the school. The teacher counter-culture thrives. It is emancipatory, creative and reflective. This ultimately is the defining aspect of the counter-culture and the "class."

While the counter-culture thrives, it does so in the recognition that the State controls curriculum choice, teacher salaries, etc. This denies a full blown opposition. One of the reasons that teachers are not fully penetrative is because of limitations resulting form the division that exist between teachers and administrators.

Limitations -- Divisions

One impeding force to teacher penetrations are what Willis calls a limitation.[30] In this study, the major limitations of teacher penetrations is the division between teachers' work and administrators' work.

Three questions need to be asked. Why does this teacher counter-culture/resistant group thrive? What is the group's eventual accommodation to

structural components of the school? What is the rationale for the establishment of the tension between the formal and informal, "they" and "we" and the "them" and "us?" One way to answer the above questions is to get clear on one major division: Apt and inept work.

One way teachers distinguish themselves from the administration at Hillview is through the tasks, actions and duties each group (administration and teachers) engages in.[32] Teachers look upon most administrative task as inept, as opposed to the good, apt work teachers do. Administrative tasks, such as scheduling classes, handling discipline, assigning rooms and organizing classes for an orderly walk down to the assembly hall, leading faculty meetings (which are usually looked upon as trite because of a lack of substance) are all judged as ineptly accomplished by a weak administration.

The administration is judged as such for other reasons. It does not deal effectively with the need to counsel students: "We have no real counselor here," comments Ms. Y. Teacher evaluation is only done sporadically, not in the "professional manner" that the teachers expect. Moreover, what is taught in class in not known or understood by the administration.

What is important, is the type of talk that typifies the administration. Anything that he/she does (be it the male principal or female vice-principal is not considered "heavy duty" or "important work." Team meetings are called "trite" and "mundane." What gets talked about in meeting, says teachers, is the "busy work," and "public relations," not the "real problems we face everyday." Thus, teachers find team meetings a waste of time and unproductive. Administrators don't handle discipline problems in what teachers call a "quick" or "effective" manner.

The administrator is typified as "weak" or "soft" in its dealings with problem students. In short, administrators are considered inferior. "Swift, sharp,

effective" action, as talked about by the eighth grade teachers, is not considered to be part of how the administration sees, understands or deals with school problems.

It is within the division of teacher work and administrator work that ineptness and inferiority rear their heads. Although the makeup of a schedule or setting up discipline procedures can be hard mental work, according to teachers it is clearly not considered their work. It is mental work that should be completed by the administration at the quick, effective, and workmanlike pace that teachers exhibit in their tasks.

The eighth grade teachers execute different tasks than the administration. They judge tasks not only to be more important than administrative tasks, but harder, more laborious, active and not passive. Teacher tasks are more serious and more needed than tasks executed by the administration. This is in part what defines common sense knowledge for this teacher's group.

Other activities, such as taking over scheduling, the designation of incoming students to different eighth grade classes, replacing other teachers who take their classes on a field trip, and the organization and execution of field trips, are what define apt work. These aspects are officially not teacher tasks. Still, teachers take on these task over and above their own in order to do them right. thus, they distinguish between apt and inept work. Hard work, be it mental or manual is completed by members of the group and is needed so as to get on good terms with the administration. (accommodation)[34]

Well executed tasks help define the teachers' status and role in the school. This leads to another limitation. Teachers at Hillview are committed to their students, even though they realize that there exist limitations to these students achievements. Unintentionally, it is the notion that "we are basically here to

help children" that limits penetrations even further. Even though there is an obvious tension between administrators and teachers, students are the first priority. Ultimately, this leads to an accommodation by teachers to structures of schooling.

Within the distinction of apt and inept work then, lies the dichotomy of the formal and informal components of the school day. For various reasons, as seen in the data, the informal takes on three general dimensions. One of these is the resistance by teachers to formal and official routines of the school. Another is an accommodation to the official realm. The third is a combination of the two. For the moment though, aptness as a teacher work phenomenon, is separate and different from perceived inept administrative duties. With this in mind, the counter culture of four teachers--in their mental and physical work, in their resistance and accommodation to official routines helps form and nurture a teacher counter-culture. This group is viewed by the administration as dysfunctional to the official routines of schooling. The principal says:

> I have a group of eighth grade teachers who simply resist my authority...there is a perceived ineptness on my part...rules are broken.

The recognition of a distinct counter-culture is confirmed. This is based on the eighth grade team's judgments of various perceived inept acts on the part of the administration, and a poor communication between the two parties. This situation helps define for teachers a weak, inept, shallow and inferior administration. Thus, the resistant teacher group takes shape, agreeing that rules will be broken: "We all arrive late to team meetings." Oppositional talk is always apparent: "The administration stinks."

Teachers then, justify assuming control over their time and space in school. They define how they will do their tasks: "We run the school," comments one eighth grade teacher. To control one's day is a major objective of the "team." It is

then, that an apparent victory of sorts is celebrated. In their opposition, and valuing of their apt physical and mental actions, teachers differentiate how "we" and "us" exist and are distinct in a very clear and definite anti-structural way from "they" and "them" — the structural, formal, official and administrative routines of the day. As a result, resistant acts by the group members or counter-culture are culturally productive, rather than reproductive.

Accommodation

The informal member group must also be explained in terms of the logic of accommodation. Giroux points out that in schools "there is a mixture of accommodating and resistant practices." [35] Although teachers are resistant to official routines of the school institution, there is also teacher accommodation to official aspects of schooling. This has been suggested through the inversion of the apt and inept qualities. Resistance by teachers is due in large part to perceived inept administrative activity. Importantly though, the inversion of these typified administrative inept tasks in the teachers' day/life damns teachers to a more elaborate giving of accommodation.

Teachers accommodate when they perform administrative tasks, (i.e., scheduling). This involves a concentrated team effort and hors of extra time. Teachers, additionally, must take care of their own classroom problems, counsel students, and organize field trips. Concurrently, and most importantly, teacher exploitation is experienced through the teachers' taking over and executing administrative functions aptly. Consequently, the inept aspects of work, become teacher duties, are inverted, and take on apt qualities.

These tasks, along with others, become the accommodative aspects of teachers. In executing administrative tasks, teacher adhere to oppositional tendencies. They believe that "we run the school." This affirms or legitimatize their resistances.

Ironically, perhaps sadly, these acts are accommodative to the structural aspects of schooling.

Interestingly, there is both the creation and breakdown of teacher opposition which is needed for structural harmony. These breakdowns will be further elaborated in the discussion of dislocations.

One dislocating tendency is for teachers not to know that in their fight for control and autonomy, resistance to authority, and breaking of rules, they are also led to accommodative behavior. This filters down through certain rewards. If work is well done, aptly performed, a letter or recommendation may be forthcoming or even a choice teaching assignment. Teachers, it seems, are induced to eventually "buy into" the official routines of schooling. After all, says Ms. Y, "there's a limit to how far we can rock the boat." Thus, accommodation dislocates further resistance. Ironically, in the fight for autonomy, teachers are damning themselves to a life of subordinated mental and physical labor, when at the same time trying to overcome domination by acts of resistance.

One major dislocation affecting group solidarity has to do with teacher confinement. Teachers are separated from each other, thus limiting time spent together as a group. The ultimate dislocating factor remains: teachers are alienated from their group for most of the day. They stand alone in class. Only occasionally do they visit each others' class. They teach different subjects and have different personal interests.

In addition to the above issues, teachers are bogged down completing individual assignments. As Willis and Harris have noted, personal and professional differences hinder group formation. Thus, the notion of the isolated individual in his/her many forms is a dislocating factor to further penetrations.

Another dislocation tendency restricting teacher penetrations is the teachers'

ignorance of the principal's knowledge of their actions. It is obvious that school management knows and understands the motivations behind the actions of individual teachers. This works to suppress the penetrations that individual teachers make. Comments the principal on his past work:

> I had a couple of teachers who'd find out procedures that would follow to suspend a kid from school. They would maneuver kids into being suspended. I'm finding it interesting that the same kind of thing still exists.

The fact is that the principal admits that teachers in his school have a "private philosophy in a public sector." This indicates that he is not naive about the goings on of his teaching staff:

> I think there has been an avoidance of team meetings to avoid discussing issues that need to be dealt with...I have teacher who is supposed to work on data processing, but uses it as a way to avoid team meetings...teachers in eighth grade use the intramural type thing as an excuse to avoid a team meeting.

Thus, administrative knowledge works in ways to help dislocate teacher resistance. The principal "knows what's coming down." This helps him designate to teachers certain administrative task (that teachers complete aptly) and helps him better understand how teacher resistance works. With this in mind, the principal "allows" certain rules to be broken, when this work to his advantage. Added to this, the principal is aware of the contested terrain to his authority, aware that sometimes teachers "look busy" in class, that S.O.A.R. is a "SORE" subject, signifying that the principal is also aware of the member group's language. The principal knows "some of these folks need some good strokes to get them going," and even when rules, like not having parties get broken, the principal comments that:

> Sometimes it's easier to have the rule broken with some of the positive things that come down.

Interestingly, teachers perceive the breaking of these rules as a defiance to both the principal's authority and the structure of the school. But while teachers defy, the principal allows it to continue by "looking the other way," aware that it

is at a boiling level. Maybe this is why "there is a perceived ineptness of my part,: muses the principal.

Related to the above, a dislocation of teacher group penetrations occurs when realizing that opposition is apparent, especially "when we don't have our act together," the principal and other administrators and his administration are able to "show a different way of handling things." Thus, getting one's act together, like having orderly assemblies, is another way of dislocating group opposition.

The notion of control acts as a dislocating force. The control of scheduling was handed over to the eighth grade team, but was taken away from them in the middle of this study. The principal explained this action as follows:

> I observed that instead of trying to schedule kids, their attitude was to get me, stick it to me, to the point that I had to take that scheduling away from them.

Therefore, even though teachers find ways to manipulate the day to their own satisfaction, there are points where these efforts get checked. "Some good comes out of all this," replies the principal when I question him on the giving and taking away of teacher autonomy. With this in mind, dislocations disallow an overthrow of the administration, and resistance of the group is managed.

A dislocation of penetrations into official components of schooling lies in the content teachers teach. Items in the hidden curriculum typifying the official and unofficial areas of study are important. Exercises within the limits of everyday curriculum fall under the official curriculum. However, the data suggest that teachers place and emphasis on capitalist items in the class as part of their content — part of the hidden curriculum. For instance, teachers reflect and transit capitalistic values by talking about commodities. They talk about the 1) completion of tasks on time, 2) value of a working class attitude of enjoying "work, work, work," 3) selling of candy for profit that will involve a trip to

spend excess profit, 4) idea of rewards as repayment for a job well done, 5) importance of cars and their value, and 6) value of competition. In countless ways, teachers suggest that capitalism is mere common sense. Moreover, in teachers' hard, opt work, they clearly show or exhibit the above values, thus damning themselves to a life of subordinate work and denying themselves other forms of cultural expression.

There is an irony in teachers' lives, that works in ways that are needed for capitalism. The fact that teachers penetrate official components of the curriculum is offset when in the process they damn and entrap themselves as overworked. While a victory is celebrated, it can only be short lived if other forms of cultural expression are negated..

Of central importance to this study is that a head-on confrontation with the administration is a routine activity at Hillview, and represents a rejection of the teacher-administrator exchange. Says Mr. X: "He's got a power struggle here." Individually, Mr. X realizes this. As a group, the strategic acts or what could also be termed informal acts, are used to counter administrative control.[37] This suggests an understanding that teachers who hold certain powers act to better their own class. Foucault, on the notion or power:

> Certainly everyone doesn't occupy the same position; certain positions preponderate and permit an effect of supremacy to be produced. This is so much the case that class domination can be exercised just to the extent that power is dissociated from the individual might.[38]

Important here, is the power the group of teachers have as defined by their resistant acts. To understand group solidarity and to utilize it to the group's advantage is a form of power, production of supremacy and a form of teacher class domination. To engage in acts of resistance would be to partake in a struggle which has both strategy and tactics, is reflective, creative and emancipatory. It has potential for consciousness raising.

Conclusions

Through teacher pragmatic routines we see a fundamental tension set-up. There is the creation of an informal teacher counter-culture group on the one hand, and the adherence to the individualistic logic and other official routines on the other hand. Thus, teachers, in striving for their own autonomy, are alienated from each other into separate classes, have a separate official curriculum, and express different views about issues in school. This weakens group solidarity.

I have here, inquired into whether there exists a sense of cultural agency among teachers. In some senses, semblances of this agency are apparent. There are, for example, instances when the "team" acts together on issues, suggesting forms of solidarity. There are, however, limits to the team's penetrations due to dislocating factors, especially the acceptance of the individualistic logic, resulting in the alienation of teachers from each other. Clearly, the lack of what Harris calls a "disposition towards collective action"[39] is a serious impediment for teachers to overcome. In short, while there is the eighth grade "team" on the one hand, there is the solitary individual teacher on the other, who desperately tries to control his/her own life in school, at least part of the time.

A question must be asked at this point. What best defines the teacher situation at Hillview? Michel Foucault helps to answer this question. Foucault talks about the relational theory of power:

> One doesn't have a power which is wholly in the hands of one person who can exercise it alone and totally over others. It's a machine in which everyone is caught, those who exercise power just as much as those over whom it is exercised...power is no longer substantially identified with an individual who possesses it by right of birth; it becomes a machinery that no one owns.[40]

Foucault's point seems well taken. Another way of saying this, is that power resides not only in the hands of the supervisors (principal, state department), but also in the hands of the teachers who belong to the counter-culture. Power is

relational - a circular process to be distributed among many individuals, as indicated by the eighth grade team's penetrations into the individualistic logic, the administrator-teacher exchange and the official routines of schooling.

Ultimately, a powerful irony remains in this study. In the celebration of their penetrations, teachers damn themselves in particular and their students in general, to a life of subordinate work. A grasp of this irony is fundamental to understanding the role of teachers in the social order.

With the above points in mind, what can be offered for teacher empowerment? This certainly has something to do with what a full penetration may look like. A full penetration on the teachers' part would not be only to realize the values of the hidden curriculum, but also to act through the hidden curriculum so as to lead students to a better understanding of how capitalistic values are enforced. This implies resistance to the official curriculum, and the attempt to manipulate and subvert the content mandated to them. This may have the effect of raising students' consciousness to their own domination.

A full penetration would also involve group action on the part of teachers that would, in the final outcome, change curriculum and school board policies. It would involve teachers being in control of the school day. This would mean teachers in control of decision making in and out of class. This full penetration, it is clear, can only be realized when teachers question and reflect on their actions and decisions in and out of their classrooms. Only then can changing policy become a serious agenda. One teacher I followed said after the study, "what can I do to improve myself?" Surely this is a fundamental question if what is meant is, what can I do to improve my "class" situation. My reply to her was to "obtain an M.A., and at the same time, do something about controlling your life at this school." This remark, or course, needs further elaboration.

How is one to control one's life when penetrations are inconspicuously dislocated? In order to become emancipated, and to empower oneself, one must first come to understand the hows and whys of domination. It is not enough just to be a good teacher and change the curriculum to suit your classes needs. This mystifies or obscures who really controls and legitimizes the knowledge of the "handed down' curriculum. Teachers, then, need to conceptualize, execute and evaluate the curriculum, not only individually, but as a group. Control of the dissemination of knowledge is at stake here. The same could be said about board policy, rules, and other official routines at the school.

What the data suggests is that teachers only barely understand the forces that dominate their lives and the lives of their superiors. More knowledge of who is in control of school decisions, including rules, policies and the like, may engender forms of resistance that would lead to teachers controlling more of their day. To control one's day by having a hardcore student discipline problem removed from one's classroom may not be the important issue. The people who decide why and where a child should be placed becomes the issue of concern. Teachers must make long term decisions that have real effects on school board policy.

It seems that these teachers' students are also victims of a power struggle between teachers and administrators. If teachers cannot understand their own role in the institution of the school, then it is even less likely that they comprehend their students' role in society. Ironically, it is teacher ignorance of not comprehending the type of curricula content taught and particular values transmitted (hidden circulum) that in the end dislocates teacher penetrations and student consciousness raising.

If one were to build for, or hope to achieve, an authentic emancipatroy program, teacher educators, teachers and students would have to understand how ironies work

in their lives. Concurrently, teacher group solidarity over issues of domination and subordination must be attained for a battle on the cultural plain to be meaningful. To succeed in a battle of this sort would allow for a collective teacher voice on change issues.

This study succeeds on a number of levels. First, there is the evident cultural struggle. To look at the role of teachers only deterministically (as passive agents of ideological apparatuses) without recognizing the struggle is to miss the openings and possibilities of educational change. To see how penetrations are made, and what limits and dislocates them, better helps understand the role of the teacher in the social order. Second, this study also succeeds in pointing to resistant acts. There is a battle ground. There is the beat of "Macho Militancy." There is also the group-"team". What is suggested is a teachers' cultural movement. This reflects the tensions, questioning and probing into aspects of their lives. For my liking however, there is not enough reflection on forms of domination. Many times, teachers in this study confront the administration and the administration's superiors. Teachers also confront their own dominated existence. Time and again, however, they also withdraw into their shells. This is due in large part to their accommodations to structural aspects of schooling--the limitations and dislocations of their penetrations. Teacher empowerment would require penetrations of the structural facets of schooling. Furthermore, teacher empowerment means for teachers to confront, with answers and actions, the hows and whys of domination and exploitation. This study points to the classic limitations of these answers and actions, but also to the possibilities of a struggle that goes further than just "macho militancy" as displayed by the "lads." It seems to me then, that with the above in mind, there is an important space for researchers to pursue looking for teacher emancipatory "resistance" at the group level. Only then

will we discover just how far away social transformation is from our grasp.

Footnotes

1. In particular I refer to Stanley Aronowitz and Henry A. Giroux. Education Under Siege. (Massachusetts, Bergin & Garvey Publishers, Ind., 1985) Henry Giroux and Peter McLaren in a recent article entitled, "Teacher Education and the Politics of Engagement: The Case for Democratic Schooling." Harvard Educational Review Vol. 56 No. 3 August 1986 pp. 213-238. Philip Wexler, in particular insists on looking past the resistant/accommodative stereotype for analyzing change in schools. More in Philip Wexler. "Change: Social, Cultural and Educational." Journal of Curriculum Theory, 3 (2) pp. 157-164. Much of what Henry Giroux has to say about the concept of "resistance" in Theory and Resistance in Education (Massachusetts: Bergin and Garvey Publishers, Inc. 1983) speaks to this problem.

   On teacher resistance, Michael Apple. Education and Power (Boston: Rootledge and Kegen Paul, 1983), p. 156-185. I also refer to a study by Robert V. Bullough, Jr. and Andrew Gitlin. "Beyond Control: Rethinking Teacher Resistance Education and Society 3(1 and 2) 1985.

2. R. Bullogh and A. Gitlin. op. cit., p. 65.

3. Ibid. p. 65-73

4. Paul Willis Learning to Labor. How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs (England: Sason House 1977).

5. McCarthy, on Habermans' notion of reflection: "Self reflection means reflection on the subjective conditions of knowledge, on the "a priori constitution" of the facts with which the objectifying deal, on the "synthetic achievements of the knowing subject." Self reflection for Habermas would be an "attempt to develop the idea of critique of ideology that aims at freeing the subject from his

dependance on "hypostatasized powers" concealed in the structures of speech and action...self reflection and liberation from dogmatic dependence...It is both a reflection and liberation from dogmatic dependence...It is both a reflection on the conditions of knowledge and critical-reflective reflection on the conditions of knowledge and critical-reflective dissolution of dogmatic life forms." In Thomas McCarthy. The Critical Theory of Jurgen Habermas. (London: M.I.T. Press, 1979, pp. 94-96)

6. Thomas McCarthy on "Emancipation": "Emancipation is understood as the overcoming of dogmatism, especially in the forms of an objectivist blindness to the subjective conditions of knowledge..."the will of reason" that is inherent is reason is the formal interest in theoretical enlightenment, in a rigorous pursuit of the ultimate conditions of knowledge and action...the implication is that emancipatory interest aims not simply at the pursuit of knowledge and reflection as such, but at practical change of established conditions, a partnership guided by critical insight into specific structures of power and ideology." McCarthy, op. cit., p. 97.
7. For instance, teacher empowerment for Stanley Aronowitz and Henry Giroux has to do with the teacher being a transformative intellectual. The transformative intellectual is one who is able to utilize critical language, is able to fight for new cultural forms, and ultimately to struggle collectively to build a language of possibility. More in Stanely Aronowitz and Henry Giroux, Education Under Seige op. cit. pp. 36-43.
8. I am alluding to researchers such as Paul Willis in Learning to Labor. (England: Saxon House. 1977), Jean Anyon. (1980) "Social class and the hidden circulum or work." Journal of Education. 162, 66-92, Jean Anyon (1981) "Social class and school knowledge." Curriculum Inquiry, 11 3-42 and a. Gitlin. (1980)

Understanding the work of teachers. Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 4266A (University Microfilm No. DA8415549).

9. Besides Willis and Anyon as mentioned in footnote No. 8., counter hegemony as a source for possible social transformation has also been used in varying aspects by R.V. Bullough Jr., A.D. Gitlin and A.D. Goldstein (1984). "Ideology, teacher role, and resistance. Teachers College Record, 87, 219-237., Andy Hargreaves. (1981) Contrastive rhetoric and extremeis talk: Teachers, hegemony and the educative context. In L. Barton and S. Walker (Eds.) Schools, Teachers and Teaching. (Sussex, England: Falmer Press, pp. 303-329.), Peter Wood's research on teacher strategies, in Peter Woods (Ed.) (1980) Teacher Strategies. (London: Croon Helm.) and Roger J. Simon's (1985) work, "But who will let you do it? Counter hegemonic possibilities for work education." Journal of Eduction, 165 (3) 235-255.

10. The concept of reskilling cannot be discussed without first adhering to the concept of deskilling. The concept of deskilling has to do with teachers executing someone else's goals and plans. In industry this can be referred to as separation of conception from execution. In schooling, this appears as well. Teachers are taught the skills to teach. They are skilled to execute tasks, assignments, the curriculum, etc. Ironically this works in ways to deskill teachers, as they are not the conceivers of plans over their work. That is, they do not determine curricular goals or establish content. They are deskilled from conception. For more on the notion of deskilling see Andre Gitlin, "School structure and teachers' Work," in Michael W. Apple, "Curriculum in the year 2000: Tensions and Possibilities," in Phi Delta Kappan, January, 1983, pp. 321-326; and Henry Braverman. Labor and Monopoly Capitaal. (New York Monthly Review Press, 1974.) the concept of reskilling has been otherwise used as an opposite

to deskilling. For this study, the notion of reskilling has to do with empowerment, through the testing of certain relationships in the school and the development of a teacher culturally productive team that is in the process of developing a language of possibility.

11. Paul Willis. "Cultural production and Theories of reproduction. In L. Barton and S. Walker (Eds.) Race, Class and Education. (London: Croon Helm, 1983, p. 114).

12. Lurking in the background here are what Willis calls the formal, official and pragmatic zones of schooling. I am particularly interested in how teachers move away from both the formal and official aspects of schooling and live in their pragmatic world. What works best for teachers then, lie in the pragmatic world. This may include oppositional tendencies such as defying formal components of the school day (as in authority/hierarchical relationships) and not adhering to official components of the day such as a mandated curriculum and a teacher handbook containing various rules. The above makes up the informal counter-culture group, and which in the long run has cultural effects.

13. Ethnomethocologists would be able to view routines and see what they reflexively meant. In other words, applying routines reflexively to a situation will eventuate in the formation of meaning-making, and thus an understanding of the reality of what an event and what is said about an event means to a subject. For a discussion on reflexivity, refer to Kenneth Leiter. A Primer on Ethnomethodology. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1980. pp. 106-157)

14. Paul Willis, Learning to Labor, op. cit., p. 166.

15. Ibid., p. 167.

16. Ibid., p. 64, for more on the fair exchange.

17. I have not mentioned the state of city where this document was written. This

is done so as to assure anonymity.

18. In the Teacher Handbook.

19. This is typical of Jean Anyon's studies on working class culture. For more, please see, Jean Anyon. "Social class and the hidden curriculum of work. "Journal of Education, 1980. 162, 66-92 and Jean Anyon "Social class and school knowledge." Curriculum Inquiry, 1981. 11 (1) 3-42.

20. This document originates in the state where the research was conducted.

21. Kevin Harris. Teachers and Classes. (London, Boston and Henley. Routledge & Kegan Paul. 1982. pp. 51-52.)

22. Ibid. p. 143.

23. Ibid., p. 120.

24. Penetrations for Willis is the ability of persons, individually and as a group to see the operations of a social institution or agency, or a cultural form, for what they really are. It is a "collective will and action" that is creative and testing of structural facets of an institution. For Willis, there are partial penetrations and full penetrations. Partial penetrations include the informal group which produces and acts on its new cultural forms, such as a language or dress code for instance. These partial penetrations are "partial" because of impeding forces, such as "divisions" as in the lads case, where the division between masculinity and femininity, had much to do with the lads penetrations being halted, which resulted in the taking on of the dominant ideology of manual labor as apposed to mental labor, which acted as their damnation into menial jobs, just what is needed for capitalist perpetuation. Thus, in a partial penetration, the individual or group is trapped. A full penetration on the other hand would play a more active role in the destruction of the school structure, no damnation, rather, the promotion of a culture, class or group that

possess the power to override its enemy. More on this can be found in Paul Willis. Learning to Labor. pp. 119-128.

25. Ibid., p. 128.

26. Ibid., p. 129.

27. Cultural Capital refers to knowledge, skills, values and attitudes that are passed between teachers and students.

28. This is the notion of counter-hegemony expressed in Jean anyon's studies mentioned in footnote 19. Here, working class values in a working class school may be denied for higher level thinking activities.

29. An item may be referred to as "any set of unspoken but acted out assumption which is about the underlying nature of a classroom or school and which is simultaneously about the underlying nature of some saliently germane sector of the wider community." In George Spindler. (1982) (ed.) Doing the Ethnography of Schooling. (New York: C.B.S. College Publishing.

30. David W. Livingston. (1983) Class Ideologies and Educational Futures. (Sussex, England: The Farmer Press. p.99.)

31. Limitations as elaborated on by Willis block, and impede on penetrations. For more see Paul Willis. 1977. op. cit., p. 119.

32. The concept of typifications can be related to that way tasks are viewed. This concept derives from Alfred Shutz. Typifications are the stock of knowledge at hand, including types of expected behavior patterns. Further discussion, see Kenneth Leiter (1980 A Primer in Ethnomethodology. (New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 4-9. A distinction must also be made between first order and second order typifications. First order typifications would be a teachers' subjective view of administrative actions typified as inept. Second order typifications would be my construction of analysis as a form of reality.

33.Common sense knowledge can be connected to the natural attitude of everyday life, something that is simply taken for granted. See Kenneth Leiter. op. cit., pp. 4-9.

34.Accommodation refers to aspects in a teacher's day at the school that focuses on adherence to structural components of the day, i.e., curriculum, rules, duties.

35.Henry Giroux (1983). op. cit., p. 248.

36.Willis (1977) uses the notion of dislocations as a major component in the shaping of inequalities. Put differently, a dislocation of penetrations operates when teachers overwork by taking on administrative tasks. This accommodation will help diffuse a penetration. Willis. op. cit., pp. 163-166.

37.Strategic action involves intersubjective validity of the rules of a game. Strategic actions would bind a group together to understand certain action as having a particular meaning. For more on strategic acts, see McCarthy (1979) op. cit., pp. 25.

38.Michel Foucault. (1980) Power and Knowledge. (New York: Pantheon Books.) p. 156.

39.Kevin Harris. op. cit., p. 150.

40.Michel Foucault. op. cit., p. 156